

spoken would apply with greater force to one whose speech was cut short by the House rising for the day and it was his duty to be present in the House and rise in his seat when the debate was resumed.

The second question is whether he may be permitted in the circumstances of the case to make a second speech.

Rule 150(1) is clearly inapplicable. The second sentence of that rule means that when a member rises to speak and catches the Speaker's eye and is called upon to speak but some extraneous circumstance intervenes and he does not proceed to speak at that time, he will lose his chance unless the Speaker permits him to speak at a later stage. 'At a later stage' obviously means, a stage later than the one when he was called upon to speak but did not do so. It must be within the recollection of Hon'ble Members that when Sri K. Pattabhiraman and Sri T. Siddalingiah both rose to speak on the Report of the Fact Finding Committee and the Chair called upon Sri K. Pattabhiraman to speak he requested the Speaker to permit Sri T. Siddalingiah to speak first. Sri K. Pattabhiraman spoke after Sri T. Siddalingiah concluded his speech. It is such a case that falls under Rule 150(1).

It is only Rule 150(2) that would apply. There is no doubt that the Speaker has the discretion to permit a member to make a second speech. But in exercising that discretion the Speaker has to balance the claims of the member who has already spoken against the claims of all the other members of the House who have not spoken at all but may desire to do so. It is not as if this case falls under one of the exceptions I have referred to above requiring that the discretion should be exercised in favour of a second speech. This is a case where the member, no doubt due to an unfortunate set of circumstances, was not in his seat to resume his speech when the debate was resumed. I think I will be failing in my duty to the House as a whole and to those members who have yet to speak to the motion if I permitted a second speech for Sri

Channabasappa. Actually Sri Channabasappa has in all spoken for four hours on the motion for consideration. This is an important motion on which I am sure several other Hon'ble Members have yet to speak.

I have therefore come to the conclusion that by absentsing himself at the proper time Sri Channabasappa has lost his right to speak on the motion and that a second speech cannot be permitted to him.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

SECRETARY.—As required by Rule 90-F of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Mysore Labour Housing (Amendment) Bill, 1955, as passed by the Legislative Council.

THE MYSORE UNIVERSITY BILL, 1955.

Motion to consider (contd.)

*ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿನ್ನ ದಿವನ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನಮೇಲೆ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. University Authorities ಎಂದರೆ University Senate, Syndicate ಮುಂತಾದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ non-official representation ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಈಗ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಈ Act ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ autonomy ಹಾಸ್ಟಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ non-official elements ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ Assembly ಮತ್ತು Councilಗೆ ಇದರ ಮೇಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಕಡಿಮೆಮಾಡಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರಾಜ್ ಅವರು ಸಹ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ non-official representation ಕಡಿಮೆಮಾಡ ಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ Social Service Board. ಕೆಲವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ, practical ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಎಂಬ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ